

**REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**1 DECEMBER 2021, 9:30 A.M.
REMOTE MEETING ON ZOOM
EMILY COOPERMAN, CHAIR**

CALL TO ORDER

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:00:00

The Chair called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. The following Committee members joined her:

Committee Member	Present	Absent	Comment
Emily Cooperman, Ph.D., chair	X		
Suzanna Barucco	X		
Jeff Cohen, Ph.D.	X		
Bruce Lavery	X		
Debbie Miller	X		
Elizabeth Milroy, Ph.D.	X		

* Owing to public health concerns surrounding the COVID-19 virus, all Committee members, staff, and public attendees participated in the meeting remotely via Zoom video and audio-conferencing software.

The following staff members were present:

- Jon Farnham, Executive Director
- Kim Chantry, Historic Preservation Planner III
- Laura DiPasquale, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Shannon Garrison, Historic Preservation Planner I
- Meredith Keller, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Allyson Mehley, Historic Preservation Planner II
- Leonard Reuter, Esq., Law Department
- Megan Schmitt, Historic Preservation Planner II

The following persons attended the online meeting:

- Paul Steinke, Preservation Alliance
- Rich Lampert
- Rye Fitzgerald
- Dennis Carlisle
- Kevin Block
- James Campenella
- Theresa Stuhlman, Parks and Recreation
- Hal Schirmer
- Cynthia Thompson
- Steven Peitzman
- Jeffrey Ogren, Esq., Bochetto and Lentz
- Aaron Wunsch

Nancy Pontone
Sally Nista
Richard Wentzel
Russell Fulton
Ronald Bednar, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Suzanne Ponsen, West Central Germantown Neighbors
Nicholas Baker, Philadelphia Streets Department
Eugene Desyatnik
Mary McGettigan
Doug Mooney
David Traub, Save Our Sites
David Fecteau, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Patrick Grossi, Preservation Alliance
Oscar Beisert
Jay Farrell
Alex Balloon, Tacony CDC
Clayton Hicks
George Earl Thomas
Allison Weiss, SoLo Germantown Civic Association
Celeste Morello

ADDRESS: FALLS BRIDGE OVER THE SCHUYLKILL RIVER

Name of Resource: Falls Bridge

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Streets Department

Nominator: East Falls Historical Society

Staff Contact: Megan Cross Schmitt, megan.schmitt@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the Falls Bridge spanning the Schuylkill River and connecting Kelly Drive and Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive, and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the bridge, constructed in 1894 and 1895 and rehabilitated in 1986, satisfies Criteria for Designation D and H. Under Criterion D, the nomination argues that the Falls Bridge is an example of “a variant of the Pratt truss form known as the Baltimore (Petit) truss...a stronger [truss] able to span distances almost two and a half times greater than the original Pratt truss form.” Under Criterion H, the nomination contends that the Falls Bridge is central to the evolution of the East Falls neighborhood, which is inextricably connected to the Schuylkill River.

While the Historical Commission may designate the bridge as historic, the Historical Commission may not be able to exert plenary jurisdiction over proposed work to the bridge. The City’s historic preservation ordinance empowers the Historical Commission to review building permit applications to ensure that the work proposed in those applications satisfies preservation standards. The Streets Department, the City agency that oversees Philadelphia’s roads and bridges, is not required to obtain building permits for its work to bridges and therefore may not be subject the Historical Commission’s review. However, the Historical Commission may serve in an advisory capacity and provide guidance regarding preservation standards to the Streets Department. And, in fact, that is already occurring. Members of the Historical Commission’s staff met with engineers at the Streets Department to discuss the Falls Bridge renovation project, which is in the planning stages. During that meeting, the engineers shared plans and showed

that the historic character of the bridge will be retained and restored as the bridge is brought up to current safety and transportation standards over the next few years.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the Falls Bridge satisfies Criteria for Designation D and H.

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:08:45

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Steven Peitzman represented the nomination.
- Nicholas Baker represented the Streets Department.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Cooperman asked if anyone from the Streets Department was in attendance.
 - o Mr. Baker said that the Streets Department had no objection to the nomination and that its staff looked forward to working with the Historical Commission on the upcoming restoration project.
- Ms. Cooperman asked if anyone from the nominating organization, the East Falls Historical Society, was in attendance.
 - o Mr. Peitzman said he was representing the East Falls Historical Society, as well as the author of the nomination, Dorothy Fitzgerald. Mr. Peitzman also acknowledged engineer Justin Spivey's contribution to the nomination.
- Ms. Cooperman stated that she was pleased to see the Falls Bridge nominated.
- Ms. Barucco agreed with Ms. Cooperman and added that the bridge was a perfect example of a resource that satisfies Criterion H because it is a real Philadelphia landmark. Ms. Barucco commented that she was always curious when a period of significance ran up to the present date; however, perhaps in this case, due to Criterion H, it made sense.
 - o Ms. Cooperman replied that since the Streets Department does not need to pull building permits in order to perform work to the bridge, the period of significance is not as important in this case as it is in other cases.
- Ms. Milroy expressed her enthusiasm for the nomination. She asked whether Criterion F was applicable given that the truss design is an important feature of the Falls Bridge, though not the first time it was used.
 - o Ms. Cooperman responded that although it is a good example of the truss system, it was not the first, and therefore does not exemplify the innovation aspect of Criterion F.
- Mr. Cohen applauded the nomination but said that his understanding of the more technical language was limited by his lack of familiarity with several of the terms used. He suggested that for nomination like this one, it would be helpful to make the descriptions of the technology more accessible to the reader. Mr. Cohen said he would have liked to know more about how color was used to call out the different structural components of the bridge. He said that while he endorsed the nomination, it left him wanting to know more.
 - o Ms. Cooperman and Ms. Milroy agreed with Mr. Cohen's comments.
- Ms. Milroy remarked that Mr. Cohen made a good point about the Falls Bridge connecting the east and west sections of Fairmount Park. Mr. Cohen responded that he wondered if connected more than just the park and also connected neighborhoods.

- Ms. Miller agreed with Mr. Cohen's remarks, adding that she believed the Falls Bridge connected the east and west sides of the city. She said that the bridge contributed to what would become suburban development in the northwest section of Philadelphia, including the neighborhoods of East Falls, Germantown, and Mount Airy. Ms. Miller noted that she was also very interested in learning more about how the bridge had originally been painted and how it would have changed its appearance.
- Mr. Lavery recognized the work of Ms. Fitzgerald who had served as an intern at the Athenaeum of Philadelphia. He also applauded the Historical Commission, the Streets Department, and the City Planning Commission for working together on the Falls Bridge.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Oscar Beisert commented in support of the nomination.
- Hal Schirmer offered comments.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The Falls Bridge was constructed in 1894 and 1895 and rehabilitated in 1986.
- The Falls Bridge is an example of the Baltimore (Petit) Truss which is a version of the Pratt Truss.
- The Falls Bridge was an important connector of the east and west sides of Fairmount Park as well as the neighborhoods on either side of the banks of the Schuylkill River.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- As an example of the Baltimore (Petit) Truss, a version of the Pratt Truss, the Falls Bridge embodies distinguishing characteristics of a specimen of engineering, satisfying Criterion D.
- The Falls Bridge is central to the evolution of the East Falls, inextricably tied to the Schuylkill River, and stands as a landmark to the neighborhood and to the city, satisfying Criterion H.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the Falls Bridge satisfies Criteria for Designation D and H.

ITEM: FALLS BRIDGE MOTION: Satisfies Criteria D and H MOVED BY: Cohen SECONDED BY: Barucco					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	X				
Suzanna Barucco	X				
Jeff Cohen	X				
Bruce Lavery	X				
Debbie Miller	X				
Elizabeth Milroy	X				
Total	6				

ADDRESS: 3421R WARDEN DR

Name of Resource: Alexander Henry Carriage House and Stable

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Thomas R. & Margaret McKeegan

Nominator: Keeping Society

Staff Contact: Megan Cross Schmitt, megan.schmitt@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the building at 3421R Warden Drive and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

The nomination contends that the building, constructed at some point between 1853 and 1875, satisfies Criteria for Designation A, C and D. Under Criterion A, the nomination argues, "From the time of its construction...until 1916, the subject property served as a carriage house and stable for important, prosperous, and successful Philadelphians and their families." The nomination contends that perhaps most important of these owners was Alexander Henry, mayor of Philadelphia from 1858 to 1865. Under Criteria C and D, the nomination states that the "cottage-like" building is a "distinctive and unusual surviving example of the Gothic Revival style." The nomination asserts that "This building was clearly influenced by designs illustrated and discussed by Andrew Jackson Downing... [who] popularized the applicability of the Gothic Revival style in American domestic architecture."

The staff notes for the Historical Commission that a staff visit to the site indicates that the building appears to be vacant and in very poor condition.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the building at 3421R Warden Drive satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D. The staff also recommends that the building, as an ancillary structure on a larger estate, fails to satisfy Criterion A; its connection to the various occupants of the estate is limited.

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:31:55

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Schmitt presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.

- Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.
- No one represented the property owner.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Cooperman asked if the property owner or a representative was in attendance or if the staff had had any contact with the property owner.
 - o Mr. Farnham responded that the requisite notice letters were mailed to the property owner at an address in Georgia and to the property itself. He stated that the staff had not received a response since the letters were sent. Mr. Farnham also noted that the property is subject to an Act 135 conservatorship action and the court has appointed a conservator to the property. He confirmed that the staff of the Historical Commission has been in touch with the attorneys representing the conservator, and they are aware of the nomination.
- Ms. Cooperman asked if the conservator or representative was in attendance.
 - o Mr. Farnham responded that they were not showing in the attendees list and no hands were raised in Zoom; however, they were aware of the meeting.
- Ms. Cooperman noted that the subject property has as much the shape of a cottage as it does a carriage house, if not more.
- Ms. Milroy remarked that she was puzzled by the date of construction because the subject building appears on the historic atlases and seems to be from the 1850s. Therefore, she wondered why it remains so difficult to pin down when this estate was established or if significant changes were made to this building. She commented that she felt confident that the date of construction could be narrowed down to the 1850s. Ms. Milroy stated that the nomination makes the point that the subject cottage is consistent with the Gothic Revival style of Andrew Jackson Downing, examples of which Mr. Beisert provided. She added that she was interested in knowing more about how this cottage related to the main house on the estate, especially because aerial views of the property seem to indicate that vestiges of that original estate are extant.
- Ms. Barucco said that the nomination described four other out-buildings that survive from this estate, and she would have been curious to know more about them because they are deserving of recognition within the context of the landscape.
 - o Mr. Beisert responded that there is a limited amount of information available as to how the estate developed. He explained that he has not been able to locate any kind of survey, and also the atlases for this section of Philadelphia were not as detailed as other areas. The papers of former resident Mayor Henry do not provide any information about the subject property.
 - o Mr. Farnham reminded the members of the Committee on Historic Designation that the main house associated with this estate was listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places in 2019.
- Ms. Milroy questioned the absence of a door which would have been large enough to accommodate a carriage. She stated that perhaps the subject property had not been used as a carriage house, but rather functioned as a cottage.
- Ms. Cooperman responded that it would make sense to her if the building was used as a farmer's cottage or a gardener's cottage, given the size of the parcel. She noted that the ground floor of the building appears altered. However, the second story and attic retain window sash that could date to the period of construction. Ms. Cooperman explained that she did not think this impacted the subject property's eligibility for designation in any way. Ms. Milroy agreed with Ms. Cooperman's comments.

- Ms. Miller said that she agreed that this building was most likely a cottage and not a carriage house, and she wondered if the structure pre-dated the existing Gothic Revival design elements now seen on the building. She noted that in looking at historic atlases, the subject building seems to be situated in an odd location between two larger estates. Ms. Miller also raised the issue of whether there was the potential for Native American archaeological sites to be located on the parcel.
- Ms. Milroy remarked that former Mayor Henry, who had once resided on the property, had been an important player in the development of Fairmount Park.
- Mr. Cohen said that he had been uncertain about this structure and whether it had been a cottage or a carriage house. He noted that the building's fenestration made him wonder whether it had been used as something beyond a stable.
- Mr. Cohen asked his colleagues what they thought about the staff's recommendation that the nomination did not satisfy Criterion A. Ms. Cooperman said that she agreed because she did not feel as though enough information had been provided to support the claim. Ms. Cooperman clarified that though they had questions about the subject property, these questions did not nullify the nomination from satisfying the other proposed Criteria for Designation, C and D.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Steven Peitzman commented in support of the nomination on behalf of the East Falls Historical Society.
- Hal Schirmer offered comments.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The building was constructed about 1850 in the Gothic Revival style.
- The ancillary structure served as a cottage on a larger estate, and as such, is an important piece of the history of the landscape of the parcel.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The cottage is a distinctive and unusual surviving example of the Gothic Revival style and was clearly influenced by the designs of Andrew Jackson Downing, satisfying Criteria for Designation C and D.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 3421R Warden Drive satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D.

ITEM: 3421R WARDEN DR

MOTION: Satisfies Criteria C and D

MOVED BY: Cohen

SECONDED BY: Laverty

VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	X				
Suzanna Barucco	X				
Jeff Cohen	X				
Bruce Laverty	X				
Debbie Miller	X				
Elizabeth Milroy	X				
Total	6				

ADDRESS: 700 S 9TH ST

Name of Resource: Ronaldson's Philadelphia Cemetery

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Philadelphia Parks & Recreation

Nominator: Celeste Morello

Staff Contact: Kim Chantry, kim.chantry@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate a portion of the property at 700 S. 9th Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that Ronaldson's Philadelphia Cemetery, now known as Palumbo Playground, satisfies Criteria for Designation A and I. The cemetery opened in 1827 and interments ended in 1918. The human remains at the site were reinterred primarily at Forest Hills Cemetery in 1950 so that the City could develop the site as a recreation center. Under Criterion A, the nomination argues that the former cemetery has significant character, interest, or value owing to potential subsurface remains. Under Criterion I, the nomination argues that the site, which once held 13,500 deceased, a caretaker's house, bell house, and winding paths throughout the headstones, may be likely to yield information important in pre-history or history, owing to a likelihood that the deepest archaeological remains are undisturbed. No above-ground evidence of the former cemetery remains.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 700 S. 9th Street satisfies Criterion for Designation I, and that the argument made for the satisfaction of Criterion A could be subsumed into the argument for Criterion I.

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 00:58:10

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Chantry presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Celeste Morello represented the nomination.
- No one represented the property owner.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Morello summarized the historic significance of the site.

- Ms. Miller agreed that the site has a high potential for archaeological significance.
- Ms. Barucco and Ms. Milroy commented in support of the nomination.
- Mr. Cohen suggested the inclusion of Criteria G and H.
 - o Ms. Cooperman noted that there are no above-ground resources to satisfy Criterion G.
 - o Some committee members agreed that the property could satisfy Criterion H.
 - o Mr. Lavery noted that this site is the absence of something rather than the something itself, being a cemetery. He agreed that it was a landmark in the neighborhood years ago when it was a cemetery, but now it is just open space being used as a playground.
- Ms. Miller commented that some landscape features remain when looking at aerial imagery.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Doug Mooney commented in support of the nomination.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The cemetery opened in 1827 and interments ended in 1918.
- No above-ground evidence of the former cemetery remains.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The former cemetery has significant character, interest, or value owing to potential subsurface remains, satisfying Criterion A.
- The site, which once held 13,500 deceased, may be likely to yield information important in pre-history or history, owing to a likelihood that the deepest archaeological remains are undisturbed, satisfying Criterion I.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 700 S. 9th Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A and I.

ITEM: 700 S 9TH ST MOTION: Satisfies Criteria A and I MOVED BY: Milroy SECONDED BY: Miller					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	X				
Suzanna Barucco	X				
Jeff Cohen	X				
Bruce Lavery	X				
Debbie Miller	X				
Elizabeth Milroy	X				
Total	6				

ADDRESS: 2101-07 N BROAD ST

Name of Resource: Berean Presbyterian Church/Bethlehem Presbyterian Church

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Berean Presbyterian Church

Nominator: Philadelphia City Planning Commission

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 2101-07 N. Broad Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the current Berean Presbyterian Church, constructed in phases between 1875 and 1887 for the Bethlehem Presbyterian Church is significant under Criteria for Designation D, E, and J. Under Criterion J, the nomination argues that the establishment and rapid expansion of Bethlehem Presbyterian Church in the 1870s and 1880s and its transition to the Berean Presbyterian Church in the mid-twentieth century exemplifies the development of the North Philadelphia community from the mid-nineteenth to mid-twentieth centuries. Designed by architect T.P. Chandler, one of Philadelphia's most influential architects of the late nineteenth century, the nomination argues that the property satisfies Criterion E, and that the octagonal church embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Gothic Revival style, satisfying Criterion D.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 2101-07 N. Broad Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D, E, and J.

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:17:10

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- David Fecteau of the Philadelphia City Planning Commission represented the nomination.
- No one represented the property owner.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Fecteau explained that the Philadelphia City Planning Commission nominated the property because a Phila2035 planning memo identified it as being significant to this part of the city.
- Ms. Milroy noted that it is a wonderful church and that she is a fan of Chandler's church buildings.
- Ms. Milroy questioned the period of significance, noting that it seems to end with transfer from white to black ownership.
 - o Mr. Fecteau responded that the intent was for the period of significance to include the significant mid-twentieth century social history and significance of both Bethlehem and Berean churches.
 - o Ms. Milroy opined that the period of significance makes the looks like the nomination is privileging the white occupation, when that is not the intent.
- Ms. Cooperman opined that Berean Presbyterian Church is significant in its own right, having been founded in 1880 near Girard College and moved to this location in 1955. She noted that there are additional discussions about its significance in an inventory of African American church resources that she worked on.
- Mr. Cohen opined that the nomination is well researched and written. He noted that, although the Historical Commission has no jurisdiction over the interior of the

property, the nomination made him curious about the degree to which the exterior octagon is reflected on the interior.

- Mr. Cohen noted that he is also struck by the quality of the school and chapel to the east. He explained that he is not sure which architects the Presbyterians were favoring in 1875 to 1876, but the design suggests Henry Sims, who designed First Presbyterian, or possibly even T.P. Chandler himself, who was also practicing at the time. He agreed with the Criteria put forward and the expansion of the Period of Significance.
- Ms. Cooperman remarked on the building's octagonal form, noting it is interesting to see Chandler emulate Isaac Pursell. She noted that the design is clearly adapting to Presbyterian church conventions, and that, while symbolism is important, so is the auditorium plan and theatricality in church service. She also remarked that Presbyterian churches have a fascination with pointy turrets. She explained that for this Presbyterian commission, Chandler adopts the approach of a design that was far from what he would have done for an Episcopalian church.
- Mr. Lavery commented that auditorium plan churches are often hidden behind plain facades, but here Chandler embraces the plan and expresses it in stone and takes advantage of this important intersection at Broad and Diamond Streets. He remarked that it was the height of architectural splendor in the last quarter of the nineteenth century.
- Mr. Lavery noted that, in context, the building was situated along of section of North Broad Street that was full of spectacular houses of worship, as well as the Church of the Advocate to the west. He remarked that the corner entrance takes advantage of locations on both important Broad and Diamond Street thoroughfares.
- Ms. Barucco noted that she has been in the church, and that the exterior entrance is on side 1 and the altar on side 5. On side 4, there is an opening to the Sabbath School, which is an Akron plan. On the northeast and southeast sides there is a balcony, and on the west side, opposite side 4, is a stage. Side 3 is disconnected from the Sabbath School and is an enclosed walkway between the two buildings. She remarked that it has a beautiful interior, and that it is possible to see the earlier building encased in the attic of the Sabbath School. She noted it is an active congregation that is active in community.
- Regarding the architectural description, Ms. Barucco commented that the first-story lancet windows are actually stained glass with integral pivot sash, and the steps are granite not concrete. She noted that Figure 18 shows the same granite for the cladding was used for the exterior steps.
 - o Mr. Cohen commented that he was struck by the use of granite, a much more serious enterprise, being used for both parts of the property.
- Ms. Milroy reiterated her concerns about the Period of Significance, noting that she would extend it to the 1970s or the present.
 - o Ms. Barucco responded that the change between white and black congregations is significant, and that she felt the proposed dates recognized the shift in the social character of the neighborhood and were obviously not meant as a slight.
 - o Ms. Milroy disagreed, opining that it reads as insignificant.
 - o Other Committee members supported the extension of the Period of Significance, but there was debate on a suitable end point. They ultimately agreed to extend the period to the latest potential date of the most recent significant alteration of the building in 1967.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Oscar Beisert supported the nomination and thanked the Planning Commission for nominating the property.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The property at 2101-07 N. Broad Street includes the church building and Sabbath School, the former constructed in 1887 and the latter in 1875.
- The existing congregation, Berean Presbyterian Church, is historically significant in its own right.
- The Period of Significance identified in the nomination, which ends after the transition from the white Bethlehem Presbyterian to the predominantly black Berean Presbyterian congregations and is intended to cover an important demographic shift in the community in the mid-twentieth century and the significance of both congregations. However, it does not adequately convey that significance.
- The design of both the church and the Sabbath School buildings are significant, the former known to have been by architect T.P. Chandler, and the latter possibly by Henry Sims or Chandler.
- The church's auditorium plan design is significant, as is the way that Chandler expressed the plan at the significant and visible corner of Broad and Diamond Streets, two important thoroughfares in North Philadelphia.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The nomination demonstrates that the establishment and rapid expansion of Bethlehem Presbyterian Church in the 1870s and 1890s and its transition to the Berean Presbyterian Church in the mid-twentieth century exemplifies the development of the North Philadelphia community from the mid-nineteenth to mid-twentieth centuries, satisfying Criterion J.
- The church was designed by architect T.P. Chandler, one of Philadelphia's most influential late-nineteenth century architects, satisfying Criterion E.
- The octagonal church embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Gothic Revival style, satisfying Criterion D.
- The period of significance should be extended to 1967, the latest potential date of the most recent significant exterior alterations to the buildings.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 2101-07 N. Broad Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D, E, and J, with a Period of Significance of 1870 to 1967.

ITEM: 2101-07 N BROAD ST MOTION: Satisfies Criteria D, E, and J, with an adjustment to the Period of Significance MOVED BY: Barucco SECONDED BY: Cohen					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	X				
Suzanna Barucco	X				
Jeff Cohen	X				
Bruce Lavery	X				
Debbie Miller	X				
Elizabeth Milroy	X				
Total	6				

ADDRESS: 1733-49 N 4TH ST

Name of Resource: Stetson Hospital/Union Mission Hospital
Proposed Action: Designation
Property Owner: Department of Public Property, City of Philadelphia
Nominator: Steven Peitzman
Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate a portion of the property at 1733-49 N. 4th Street as historic and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the former Union Mission Hospital, later renamed the Stetson Hospital, constructed between 1903 and 1904, is significant under Criteria for Designation A, D, and E. Under Criterion A, the nomination argues that the property has significant interest or value as part of the industrial heritage of Philadelphia and to its medical history as the only “company hospital” in the city, as well as for its association with manufacturer John B. Stetson and his benevolent feudalism. Under Criterion D, the nomination asserts that the building embodies distinguishing characteristics of what the nominator calls the “second Renaissance revival,” including its rusticated base, arched entrance, and modillioned cornice. Under Criterion E, the nomination explains that the design is the work of prolific firm Ballinger & Perrot.

The south or rear wing of the complex, which is not included within the proposed boundary for designation, has been declared Imminently Dangerous by the Department of Licenses and Inspections and will be demolished

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1733-49 N. 4th Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, and E.

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 01:48:36

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Steven Peitzman represented the nomination.
- No one represented the property owner.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Peitzman thanked Ms. DiPasquale for helping to strengthen the nomination, and David Traub, the architect for the renovation of the building in the 1970s. He commented that the building is important for its unusual beginning, but also for then becoming representative of neighborhood dispensaries. He opined that it is a handsome building by an important firm.
- Ms. Milroy commented that it is a great nomination, but suggested extending the Period of Significance, which is proposed as 1904 to 1906, to 1971 and the closure of the Stetson factory.
 - o Ms. Barucco agreed, noting the relationship to the factory is part of its significance.
 - o Other Committee members agreed.
- Ms. Cooperman remarked that, just because a building is the last or the only does not make it important necessarily, but this property is important because of Stetson's paternalistic approach, and the significance of the Stetson complex and the whole system Stetson created. She opined that the significance of the building stands on its own without being the last or the only.
- Mr. Cohen opined that it is a well-researched and written nomination and that he appreciates nominator's ability to contextualize the property within the larger medical history of the city.
- Ms. Miller commented that it is a building in three parts. She noted that she is interested in the open area of the courtyard because workers' rowhouses would have been purchased by Stetson and subsequently demolished. She noted that Stetson acquired the adjacent rowhouse in 1887 to serve as a laboratory, and there is strong potential for shaft features in the back of the property that might be informative of workers who would have lived there and the technological advances in modern medicine. She wondered if the building was constructed with indoor plumbing, noting that there would be cause for shaft features if not. She noted that the courtyard does not seem to have been developed upon since the creation of the hospital.
 - o Mr. Cohen responded that he is sure the building was constructed with indoor plumbing. He also noted the white paint over the entry is not great.
 - o Ms. Miller noted that shaft features filled with medical waste could be below the building, especially below the wing that is not included in the proposed boundary.
 - o Ms. Miller suggested that, if the Committee is in favor of the inclusion of Criterion I, the period of significance begin in 1870, when the rowhouses started to be developed.
 - o Ms. Barucco questioned whether the one-story structure in the courtyard is large enough to disturb underground resources. She also noted that the south addition is not included in the nomination. She referred to Figure 14 showing an existing one-story structure filling the courtyard, not open space.
 - o Ms. Miller responded that the foundation could be shallow.
- Mr. Farnham asked the Committee to clarify which portion of the property it was discussing with regard to Criterion I. He explained that the boundary description on page 2 of the nomination makes it clear that the nomination is limited to the northern half of the property. If the Committee proposes that there may be archaeological resources in the southern half of the property, it could not expand the boundary without notice to the property owner. He noted that the property owner is the City of Philadelphia, so it may not object, but that it is important to clarify.
 - o Ms. Miller noted that there were structures prior to the hospital where the existing building sits. She deferred to her colleagues.

- o Ms. Cooperman noted that it is important to provide due process to all property owners, even if the property is City-owned. The nomination is clear about what is nominated, and the Committee should not stray beyond that boundary. She noted that the Committee often provides recommendations on Criteria that may be different than what is cited, and should stay within the proposed boundary, but make the point that there may be shaft features on the other part of the property that is not included in the nomination.
- o Mr. Cohen suggested the inclusion of Criterion I for the portion of the property proposed for designation.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub commented that there were more buildings remaining of the Stetson complex in the 1970s when he worked on the hospital building, but that it is now the last of the Stetson complex. He noted that Stetson took care of its workers. He opined that the remaining hospital building is fine architecture, and a distinctive historical monument in the history of paternalistic industry and medicine, like Disston.
- Paul Steinke from Preservation Alliance supported the nomination, noting it is the last of Stetson complex, with its own distinctive characteristics that make it worthy of preservation. He also noted that he visited the southern wing of the structure that has been declared Imminently Dangerous, and appealed to the Commissioner of the Department of Licenses & Inspections to give the building a reprieve. He opined that the building could be rehabbed. He expressed hope that the entire complex can be saved and an amendment to the nomination submitted.
- Celeste Morello supported the nomination, remarking on the significance of paternalistic industry and creating a village within a city. She opined that it is important for the property to stand and attest to that history, because there are not many of its type left.
- Oscar Beisert supported the nomination.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The boundary of the proposed designation is limited to the northern half of a larger parcel.
- The former Union Mission Hospital, shortly thereafter renamed Stetson Hospital, was constructed between 1903 and 1904.
- The building is the last remaining portion of the Stetson hat complex, but it is its history and not the fact that it is the last that makes it historically significant.
- The significance of the property includes its relationship to John B. Stetson and the pattern of benevolent feudalism in Philadelphia's industrial heritage.
- Prior to the construction of the hospital, rowhouses and their yards and appurtenances covered the whole parcel. The potential for archaeological shaft features related to those earlier houses as well as medical waste from the subsequent hospital construction remains.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The property has significant interest or value as part of the industrial heritage of Philadelphia and to its medical history as the only “company hospital” in the city as well as for its association with manufacturer John B. Stetson and the history of paternalistic industry, satisfying Criterion A.

- The building embodies distinguishing characteristics of the second Renaissance Revival style, satisfying Criterion D.
- The building was designed by the firm of Ballinger & Perot, a prolific firm whose work significantly influenced the development of the city, satisfying Criterion E.
- The property may be likely to yield information important to the history of the residential occupants of the rowhouses that sat on the property as well as to the medical history of the site, satisfying Criterion I. However, given that the nomination only proposes to designate the northern half of the property, the recommendation for the addition of Criterion I to the nomination is limited to the nominated portion of the property.
- The period of significance should begin in 1870, the approximate construction date of the original rowhouses on the site, and end in 1971, with the closure of the Stetson factory.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the portion of the property at 1733-49 N. 4th Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, E, and I, with an amended Period of Significance from 1870 to 1971.

ITEM: 1733-49 N 4TH ST MOTION: Satisfies Criteria A, D, E, and I MOVED BY: Cohen SECONDED BY: Laverty					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	X				
Suzanna Barucco	X				
Jeff Cohen	X				
Bruce Laverty	X				
Debbie Miller	X				
Elizabeth Milroy	X				
Total	6				

ADDRESS: 1206 CHESTNUT ST

Name of Resource: Philadelphia Federal Credit Union

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: 1206 Chestnut LLC

Nominator: Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia

Staff Contact: Laura DiPasquale, laura.dipasquale@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 1206 Chestnut Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that building, constructed in 1922 and re-clad in 1963, satisfies Criteria for Designation A and D. Under Criterion A, the nomination contends that the property represents the development of Center City, Philadelphia from residential to commercial in the late-nineteenth through mid-twentieth centuries. Under Criterion D, the nomination argues that the front façade of the building, installed in 1963, embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Mid-Century Modern style.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1206 Chestnut Street satisfies Criterion for Designation D, and that the arguments made for Criterion A better reflect Criterion J.

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:11:30

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. DiPasquale presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Patrick Grossi represented the nomination.
- Attorney Jeffrey Ogren, architect Richard Wentzel, and historic preservation consultant George Thomas represented the property owner.

DISCUSSION:

- Mr. Grossi explained that the distinctive façade is of primary interest because there are very few intact mid-twentieth century facades in Center City. Addressing the staff recommendation, he noted that he would accept Criterion J instead of A.
- Mr. Ogren opined that historic designation is intended to benefit the city, but that, when it limits a building so it cannot be used, it has no benefit. He opined that designation should take into consideration viable uses. If designated, this landlocked building with no legal windows would not be an asset to the city. He opined that it should have been clear with the overturning of the Robinson building designation that this is a bad idea. He noted that the new owners purchased the property sight-unseen, and if designated, it would have no value.
- Ms. Cooperman responded that the future use of the building is not part of the Committee's purview and suggested that they move along if the owners would like time reserved for Mr. Thomas.
- Mr. Ogren argued that they are being given inadequate time and that it is beneficial for the Committee to have all the information they have and want to present.
- Ms. Cooperman explained that she announced the times allotted for each representative at the beginning of the meeting, which are based on the Commission's Guidelines for Conduct at Public Meetings.
- Mr. Wentzel made a presentation on the uses that would not be allowed by code, existing building code, and property maintenance code, and what would not be permitted for the existing building. He explained that the building has no operable windows on the front façade, and if designated, the owners would not be able to fix it. He noted that the western wall has one foot setback and no fire separation between this and a potential building to the west. He noted that they cannot upgrade to other use groups because of egress problems, basically being surrounded on two sides with windowless walls and a fixed storefront. At best, they may be able to use two-thirds of the first floor.
- Mr. Thomas presented a series of slides. He opined that the Committee has an obligation to determine whether a property should be burdened with designation. He argued that the property will not be usable for its intended purpose because it has no legal windows; it cannot be used for residential purposes. He opined that the building should not be designated for having an amusing façade. He noted that the nomination provides nothing about architect, but mostly tells the story of the property's early development. He opined that the façade is a kit of parts, with no details of interest. He asserted that the nomination fails to include a discussion of design context or Philadelphia's mid-century modern architecture, which was weighty

and sculptural. He argued that, when the nomination was drafted, it was well-known that development was coming to Chestnut Street and that there was a significant development scheme for 1208 Chestnut Street. He noted that when 1206 Chestnut was listed for sale in 2019, the development potential of the site was critical. The adjacent property was marketed for mixed-use development, per its CMX-5 zoning. He opined that this high level of zoning is what makes the property at 1206 Chestnut valuable. He noted that the 1208 site looks similar to 1206, but actually runs all the way to Sansom Street, so it can have windows on both Chestnut and Sansom Street, and because it is longer, can have light wells. 1206 Chestnut, he argued, does not have the same advantages and is functionally a blind building. He noted that these issues impacted the 1962 design, particularly from a fire exit perspective. Since 1208 Chestnut is not designated, there is the potential that a development project on that site will completely block the side windows of 1206 Chestnut, which cannot meet zoning requirements for air and light. Mr. Thomas provided a series of slides citing the City of Philadelphia's historic preservation ordinance, arguing that there must be an understanding of how a building will function or a designation runs the risk of destroying the value of the site. He noted that, when the Preservation Alliance conducted a survey of Mid-Century Modern buildings in Philadelphia, Colonial Federal/1206 Chestnut was not on it. He opined that the second purpose of the Commission is economic, to strength the economy by stabilizing and improving property values, citing the Victor Gruen Robinson building at 1020 Market Street as a comparable example. He described the building as a liability, fire risk, and attractive nuisance. He opined that the nomination should be rejected.

- Mr. Ogren attempted to make additional closing remarks.
 - o Ms. Cooperman noted that the owners' representatives were now 4.5 minutes over time.
- Mr. Ogren commented that he respects what the Committee does and apologized for raising voice earlier. He opined that, of all buildings he watched the Committee consider today, this one stands out like a sore thumb. He urged Committee to reject the nomination.
- Ms. Miller questioned when building was reclad in 1922 whether the older building was totally demolished or was there an assumption that the foundations of the earlier building were incorporated.
 - o Mr. Grossi responded that he cannot speak to the foundations, but the building prior to 1922 was demolished.
- Mr. Cohen commented that, in terms of the Committee's charge, the question of whether the building has historical or architectural significance is a simpler question than its reuse, but that with creative design, the building may be able to be adapted.
 - o Ms. Cooperman interjected that real estate and reuse questions are not germane to the Committee's discussion.
- Mr. Cohen noted that he does not understand why they blocked up the front windows. Mr. Cohen argued that, even though Mr. Thomas cast the façade as a collection of cliches, it is a facade that stands out in a very Modernist way in a visually competitive environment. He noted an interest in the architect's write up and the post-war period. He opined that there is a calligraphic effect of the front, and that it is a well-considered nomination on the design.
- Ms. Cooperman responded to Mr. Thomas's comments, noting that the nomination does not assert that the architect is significant, and that would not be an appropriate criterion to invoke. She noted, however, that she agrees with the arguments in the nomination for Criterion D in the architectural style.

- Mr. Cohen agreed with the staff recommendation that the arguments for Criterion A better reflect Criterion J.
- Ms. Milroy opined that it is a witty façade, noting that the roundels remind her of coins, which might be a stretch, but it seems like a witticism given that it was a bank.
- Ms. Barucco opined that it is a strong nomination, and the fact that it stands out is part of what makes it eligible for designation. She noted that it is impressive that the original and complete design of the façade has survived top to bottom, which is unusual for Center City commercial buildings. She noted that she has long admired the building.
- Ms. Cooperman noted that the nomination fits in to a set of recent nominations, including the discussion of the Sophy Curson building, as yet another example of a design somewhere between the high style of Sophy Curson and the quickly changing mid-century modern commercial designs after World War II.
- Mr. Lavery noted that the depressed nature of the real estate market in the 1980s perhaps spared this building from redevelopment. He noted that a full set of drawings documenting this change came to the Athenaeum earlier this year, and within two days of the material being posted on the Philadelphia Architects and Buildings website, the owners' representatives were using them. He noted it is great to have documentation on both sides.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Oscar Beisert supported the nomination. He opined that the property owner's presentation was irrelevant to the Committee, and the fact that it sticks out like a sore thumb might be reason to designate it.
- Hal Schirmer commented that he does not know who the owner is, but it appears to be a flipper. He opined that the owner's own listing in MLS shows that it has valuable zoning which allows for more than residential use.
- Celeste Morello supported the nomination. She opined that the Preservation Alliance has credibility when they nominate a building. She noted that all buildings are different, and the city has a wide range of architecture that is worthy of designation.
- David Traub of Save Our Sites supported the nomination. Contrary to Mr. Thomas's assertions, he opined that the façade is handsome, with rows of medallions insistent on their presence, opposed by a wave-like canopy, and framed by an embracement.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- Its purview is limited to the significance of the property, not to matters of reuse.
- The building's character-defining front façade is a witty and successful design for a bank tenant in a visually competitive environment of mid twentieth-century Center City.
- The façade is a remarkably intact composition which has survived top to bottom.
- The design of the façade falls on a continuum between high-style Modernist design and quickly changing mid-century modern commercial designs.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The front façade embodies distinguishing characteristics of Mid-Century Modern style, satisfying Criterion D.
- The property represents the development of Center City Philadelphia from residential to commercial in the late-nineteenth through mid-twentieth centuries, satisfying Criterion J.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1206 Chestnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation D and J.

ITEM: 1206 CHESTNUT ST MOTION: Satisfies Criteria D and J MOVED BY: Lavery SECONDED BY: Barucco					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	X				
Suzanna Barucco	X				
Jeff Cohen	X				
Bruce Lavery	X				
Debbie Miller	X				
Elizabeth Milroy	X				
Total	6				

ADDRESS: 1935-37 CHESTNUT ST

Name of Resource: Shimwell & Logan Building

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: 1935 Chestnut St LLC

Nominator: Center City Residents' Association

Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate a building located at 1935-37 Chestnut Street and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Two buildings stand on the parcel at 1935 and 1937. This nomination focuses on the 1935 Chestnut Street building only. The building was constructed in the Italianate style during the mid-nineteenth century but was redesigned for the Shimwell & Logan Optical Company in 1921 by architect Ernest H. Yardley. The nomination contends that the building satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D. Under Criterion C, it argues that the redesigned front facade expresses distinguishing characteristics of Modern Classicism that became popular in the United States during the interwar years. Under Criterion D, the nomination asserts that the facade reflects an Italian Palazzo style with refined classical detailing. The subject building represents an era characterized by the Modern Classical style, which gained distinction during this period in red brick Philadelphia. The period of significance is limited to 1921, the time of the façade's reconstruction

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the building at 1935 Chestnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D.

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:43:55

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.

- No one represented the property owner.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Cooperman commented that the nomination was well-done.
 - o Ms. Barucco agreed.
- Mr. Cohen stated that the context for the period, recognized generally as Interwar Classicism, is not sufficiently explored. He stated that Robert Stern's term "composite," is not something he has seen anybody else use and that the nomination needs more explanation if using this label. He noted that you can clearly see the Beaux Arts roots in the design, and you can clearly see a degree of simplification that creates a kind of modernity. He opined that the building's design is a representative work, rather than a stellar work, but is one that is a testament to the changes on Chestnut Street at the time.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub, representing Save our Sites, commented in support of the nomination.
- Steven Peitzman commented in support of the nomination.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The building's reconstructed façade represents the introduction of a new architectural style to the area and signifies Chestnut Street's transition from residential to commercial use.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The redesigned front façade expresses distinguishing characteristics of Modern Classicism, which became popular in the United States during the interwar years, satisfying Criterion C.
- The facade reflects an Italian Palazzo style with refined classical detailing, representing an era characterized by the Modern Classical style, satisfying Criterion D.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 1935-37 Chestnut Street satisfies Criteria for Designation C and D.

ITEM: 1935-37 CHESTNUT ST MOTION: Satisfies Criteria C and D MOVED BY: Milroy SECONDED BY: Cohen					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	X				
Suzanna Barucco	X				
Jeff Cohen	X				
Bruce Lavery	X				
Debbie Miller	X				
Elizabeth Milroy	X				
Total	6				

Mr. Lavery excused himself from the meeting.

ADDRESS: 928-30 CHRISTIAN ST

Name of Resource: Madonna House

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: James Campenella

Nominator: Celeste Morello

Staff Contact: Allyson Mehley, allyson.mehley@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 928-30 Christian Street, historically known as Madonna House, and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. Under Criterion A and J, the nomination contends that the building was constructed to satisfy needs for social, settlement, and missionary facilities for new Italian immigrants in South Philadelphia during the early twentieth century. As the headquarters of the Catholic Missionary Society, Madonna House provided a range of services including medical assistance, literacy classes, religious instruction, and more to lower-income Italian immigrants. The Madonna House is representative of the Catholic Church's historic role in social and settlement work within immigrant communities in Philadelphia. Under Criterion D, the nomination claims that the building is a fine example of the "Palazzo" or Renaissance Revival style. The choice of this style was intended to provide a sense of familiarity to the immigrants it served. Finally, under Criterion H, the nomination argues that, owing to its architectural style and relationship to St. Paul's Parish, the building represents an established and familiar visual feature of the neighborhood. The period of significance is limited to the time of construction, 1923 and 1924.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the building at 928-30 Christian Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, and J. The staff recommends that the building does not satisfy Criterion H.

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 02:53:00

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Mehley presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.

- Celeste Morello represented the nomination.
- Cynthia Thompson represented the property owner.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Thompson stated that the owner, James Campenella, opposes the designation.
- Ms. Cooperman commented that the nomination was informative, and that she learned a lot about the significance of benevolent societies.
- Ms. Barucco opined that the nomination was well done and that this type of building is significant on many levels because of its representation of the immigrant experience. It was a location where immigrants assimilated into American society and it is important to acknowledge this period and this type of benevolence. She stated that she supports this nomination. She added that the architectural style appropriately reflects the heritage of the Italian Market area.
- Ms. Miller noted that Madonna House represents the neighborhood that grew up around it. She continued that it is a physical embodiment of the community that established it, and this is important to protect. Ms. Miller concluded that she supports the nomination.
- Mr. Cohen commented that the nomination relies too heavily on the grand stone palazzi of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. In fact, it is something a bit different. He observed that it is symmetrical and grand, but it is not stone, and there is something significant about its brickwork, with its colorful and richly textured brick with thick mortar joints. He stated that the nomination should discuss twentieth-century representations of Italian identity rather than fifteenth and sixteenth-century instances. Mr. Cohen concluded that the building is worthy of historic designation.
- Ms. Milroy agreed with other Committee comments, stating that it would be interesting to look at what is going on in southern Italy in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries as it relates to this building.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- David Traub, representing Save our Sites, commented in support of the nomination.
- Oscar Beisert commented in support of the nomination.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The nomination describes the role of benevolent organizations in Philadelphia in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and the critical role they held in assimilating immigrants into American society.
- The architecture is likely more connected to design influences of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries than the Italian palazzo designs of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries noted in the nomination.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The building was constructed to satisfy needs for social, settlement, and missionary facilities for new Italian immigrants in South Philadelphia during the early twentieth century and is representative of the Catholic Church's historic role in social and settlement work within immigrant communities in Philadelphia, satisfying Criteria A and J.
- The building is a fine example of the "Palazzo" or Renaissance Revival style, satisfying Criterion D.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 928-30 Christian Street satisfies Criteria for Designation A, D, and J.

ITEM: 928-30 CHRISTIAN ST					
MOTION: Satisfies Criteria A, D, and J					
MOVED BY: Barucco					
SECONDED BY: Cohen					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	X				
Suzanna Barucco	X				
Jeff Cohen	X				
Bruce Laverty					X
Debbie Miller	X				
Elizabeth Milroy	X				
Total	5				1

ADDRESS: 224 W WASHINGTON LN

Name of Resource: Taws Cottage

Proposed Action: Designation

Property Owner: Conarro Jawan LLC

Nominator: West Central Germantown Neighbors

Staff Contact: Meredith Keller, meredith.keller@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: This nomination proposes to designate the property at 224 W. Washington Lane and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The nomination contends that the Gardener's Cottage of the Lewis and Martha Taws Estate satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, G, and J. Under Criteria C and D, the nomination argues that the property reflects the Gothic Revival style of architecture and reflects the built environment in an era characterized by that style. Under Criterion G, the nomination contends that the property is "nestled within a distinctive nineteenth-century vignette of ancillary suburban, estate buildings and features that conform to a Romantic ideal in architecture and the Picturesque in landscape." Under Criterion J, the nomination argues that the property reflects the cultural, economic, social, and historical heritage of the Germantown community.

A development project for the site was underway when the Historical Commission notified the property owner on 28 October 2021 that it would consider a nomination proposing to designate the property. A zoning permit application for a three-story duplex building (ZP-2021-004730) was processed by the Department of Licenses and Inspections (L&I) on 30 April 2021, though the permit has not yet been issued. Two building permit applications (RP-2021-015619 and RP2021-017667) were submitted to L&I around the time of the notice. RP-2021-015619, which proposes to demolish a portion of the existing building and construct an addition, was started in eCLIPSE on 4 October 2021 and determined complete by L&I on 3 November 2021. RP2021-017667, which proposes to construct a three-story duplex adjacent to the existing structure, was started in eCLIPSE on 3 November 2021 and determined complete by L&I on 5 November 2021. The Historical Commission's staff will confer with L&I and the Law Department to

determine whether RP-2021-015619 was “filed” before the date of the notice letters. If it was, the Historical Commission does not have the authority to review or deny the application.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 224 W. Washington Lane satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and J. The staff contends that the nomination does not make a cogent argument for Criterion G.

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:07:45

PRESENTERS:

- Ms. Keller presented the nomination to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- Oscar Beisert represented the nomination.
- No one represented the property owner.

DISCUSSION:

- Ms. Keller stated that the staff has been in contact with the property owner and an attorney representing the owner and that the owner opposes the designation of the property. She added that the owner contests the filing date of building permit application RP-2021-015619 identified by staff.
- Mr. Beisert commented that he found sufficient evidence that this building functioned as a gardener’s cottage for an estate fronting Tulpehocken Street and extending to Washington Lane. He contended that the streetscape has a distinctive feeling that includes other landscape features, adding that the buildings stand out within the dense Germantown environment as a “distinctive vignette” with a picturesque quality. He noted the staff’s argument against the inclusion of Criterion G and referred the Committee to photographs and a discussion on pages 17 and 18 of the nomination. He argued that the property is distinctive, owing to the wall and open landscape and is set apart from other properties on Washington Lane. He concluded that few Gothic Revival gardener’s cottages survive in Philadelphia and asked that the property be designated and preserved despite the current plans to demolish the building.
- Ms. Milroy observed that the period of significance is contradicted within the nomination, noting that it is listed as 1880 on the nomination form and written as 1860 to 1861 within the body of the nomination. She asked that the period be amended to start in 1860 to correspond with the building’s construction date and to end in 1923. She asked Mr. Beisert whether he could more definitively state that the building was designed by James C. Sidney, since it strongly resembles the Sidney building illustrated in the nomination. She then argued against including Criterion G, adding that she does not find that the nomination demonstrates that the property is part of or related to a square or park. She agreed with the other criteria identified in the nomination.
- Mr. Cohen stated that the adjacent stable shows the hierarchy of the estate’s buildings. The stable, he continued, was much more imposing on Washington Lane than the cottage. He remarked that the stable and cottage reinforce the “horticultural country” found within Germantown among the successful individuals who commuted downtown. He observed that the property passed through the hands of John Fraser at about the time the cottage was being designed. He questioned whether the building was a commission by fellow architect, James C. Sidney, or whether Fraser himself designed the building.
 - o Mr. Beisert responded that Mr. Cohen’s observation is the reason he did not propose an architect. He commented that Fraser owned the twin on Tulpehocken

Street while Sidney designed a cottage in a very similar design to the gardener's cottage at the rear of the twin's property. He stated that he would need to locate more information to be able to attribute the building's design to one of the two architects. He added that the enclosed front porch was historically open, and it would have even more closely resembled the building in the Sidney drawing when first constructed.

- o It was noted that the stable stands on a separate property and is not proposed for designation by this nomination.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Russell Fulton, representing the West Central Germantown Neighbors, commented in support of the nomination.
- Hal Schirmer commented in support of the nomination.
- Allison Weiss, representing the SoLo Germantown Civic Association, commented in support of the nomination.
- Celeste Morello commented in support of the nomination.
- Steven Peitzman commented in support of the nomination.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The property has an outstanding legal question regarding the filing date of building permit application RP-2021-015619, which proposes to demolish most of the nominated building and construct a duplex on the site. If the Department of Licenses and Inspections and Law Department find that the permit application was filed prior to 28 October 2021, the date notice of the nomination was sent, the Historical Commission does not have the authority to review or deny the application.
- The start date of the Period of Significance is listed inconsistently in the nomination and should reflect the date of construction, 1860 to 1861.
- The building strongly resembles a cottage designed by architect James C. Sidney, though the property was owned by architect John Fraser. The architect of the cottage remains unknown, though Sidney or Fraser likely designed it.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The nomination argues that the property reflects the Gothic Revival style of architecture and reflects the built environment in an era characterized by that style, satisfying Criteria C and D.
- The nomination contends that the property reflects the cultural, economic, social, and historical heritage of the Germantown community, satisfying Criterion J.
- The nomination fails to demonstrate that the property is part of or related to a square, park, or distinctive area and does not satisfy Criterion G.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the nomination demonstrates that the property at 224 W. Washington Lane satisfies Criteria for Designation C, D, and J, with an amended period of significance from circa 1860 to 1923.

ITEM: 224 W WASHINGTON LN

MOTION: Satisfies Criteria C, D, and J

MOVED BY: Barucco

SECONDED BY: Cohen

VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	X				
Suzanna Barucco	X				
Jeff Cohen	X				
Bruce Laverty					X
Debbie Miller	X				
Elizabeth Milroy	X				
Total	5				1

ADDRESS: 1810 RIDGE AVE

Name of Resource: Ridge Avenue Farmers' Market

Proposed Action: Rescission

Property Owner: 18th and Ridge LLC

Nominator: Historical Commission

Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: The Historical Commission is considering whether to remove the property at 1810 Ridge Avenue from the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The Ridge Avenue Farmers' Market stood on the property at 1810 Ridge Avenue from 1875 to 1997. The market hall was designed by architect Davis E. Supplee. Acting on a recommendation of the Historic Values Committee, a predecessor of the Committee on Historic Designation, the Historical Commission designated 1810 Ridge Avenue on 28 May 1968. The minutes of the Historical Commission's and committee's meetings do not indicate a reason or basis for the designation, other than to identify the designated resource as "Ridge Ave. Farmer's Market," and no nomination was produced. However, a National Register nomination was written in 1983.

The market hall suffered a major fire in June 1952 and was eventually abandoned following the civil unrest in the 1960s. Vacant and untended, it fell into disrepair. In 1983, an entrepreneur attempted to revitalize the building as a farmers' market again, but the project, embroiled in litigation, never got off the ground and the building continued to decay. In 1993, the Department of Licenses and Inspections (L&I) ordered the owner to repair or demolish the unsafe building. However, that order went unheeded. On 6 March 1997, the building partially collapsed during strong winds that accompanied a winter storm. L&I began demolishing the remainder of the building the following day. The building was completely demolished and the lot regraded, fenced, and planted with grass. The property sat vacant for several years but was later subdivided and redeveloped with the Historical Commission's consent.

Section 5.14.b.1.a of the Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations stipulates that the Commission may rescind the designation of a property and remove its entry from the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places if the resource has ceased to satisfy the Criteria for Designation because the qualities that caused its original entry have been lost or destroyed. While the property was designated prior to the adoption of the current historic preservation

ordinance and its Criteria for Designation, it seems apparent that the market hall was designated for its architectural and socio-cultural significance as well as its landmark prominence on Ridge Avenue. The role of the Committee on Historic Designation in reviews such as this one is to determine whether the qualities that caused original entry of the property on the Register have been lost or destroyed or, in other words, whether the property has ceased to satisfy the criteria that led to its original designation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the Historical Commission find the resource has ceased to satisfy the Criteria for Designation because the qualities that caused its original entry have been lost or destroyed, and that it rescind the designation of 1810 Ridge Avenue and remove it from the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, pursuant to Section 5.14.b.1.a of the Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations.

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:27:35

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the rescission to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- No one represented the property owner.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The resource has ceased to satisfy the Criteria for Designation because the qualities that caused its original entry have been lost or destroyed.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The Historical Commission can rescind the designation of 1810 Ridge Avenue and remove it from the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, pursuant to Section 5.14.b.1.a of the Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Historical Commission rescind the designation of 1810 Ridge Avenue and remove it from the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, pursuant to Section 5.14.b.1.a of the Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations.

ITEM: 1810 RIDGE AVE MOTION: Rescind designation MOVED BY: Cooperman SECONDED BY: Cohen					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	X				
Suzanna Barucco	X				
Jeff Cohen	X				
Bruce Laverty					X
Debbie Miller	X				
Elizabeth Milroy	X				
Total	5				1

Ms. Barucco excused herself from the meeting.

ADDRESS: 1533-41 N 16TH ST

Name of Resource: Seventh-Day Adventist Church

Proposed Action: Rescission

Property Owner: Allegheny East Conference of Seventh-Day Adventist

Nominator: Historical Commission

Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: The Historical Commission is considering whether to remove the property at 1533-41 N. 16th Street from the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The Historical Commission designated the property at the southeast corner of 16th and Oxford Streets on 1 July 1982, along with several other buildings on the 1500-block of N. 16th Street. At the time of designation, a late nineteenth-century church stood on the site. The nomination explains that the building was erected for the Reformed Episcopal Church of Our Redeemer. It further explains that church was later occupied by two Armenian congregations before the Allegheny East Conference of Seventh-Day Adventist purchased it in 1966. A Pennsylvania Historic Resource Survey Form in the Historical Commission's files, prepared by Michael Lewis in 1984, identifies the architect of the church as Frank Watson and dates the building to 1893.

Newspaper reports indicate that the church building suffered a massive five-alarm fire in October 1991. The fire was started by workers using a propane torch to install a new roof. The church building was demolished shortly after the fire to abate the dangerous condition. A new church was erected on the site in the late 1990s, apparently without the Historical Commission's review or approval. A site plan for the new church in the Historical Commission's files includes the following hand-written note: "Plan of new church; designated building burned four years ago & new plans never forwarded to the PHC for approvals 8/15/2000." The Historical Commission's staff discovered that the historic church building had been lost to fire 30 years ago but that the address remained on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places during a recent, routine review of records and is requesting that the Historical Commission consider rescinding its designation.

Section 5.14.b.1.a of the Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations stipulates that the Commission may rescind the designation of a building and remove its entry from the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places if the resource has ceased to satisfy the Criteria for Designation because the qualities that caused its original entry have been lost or destroyed. While the property was designated prior to the adoption of the current historic preservation ordinance and its Criteria for Designation, the nomination indicates that the church was designated for its architectural qualities, which were lost with the fire and subsequent demolition. The role of the Committee on Historic Designation in reviews such as this one is to determine whether the qualities that caused original entry of the property on the Register have been lost or destroyed or, in other words, whether the property has ceased to satisfy the criteria that led to its original designation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the Historical Commission find the resource has ceased to satisfy the Criteria for Designation because the qualities that caused its original entry have been lost or destroyed, and that it rescind the designation of 1533-41 N. 16th Street and remove it from the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, pursuant to Section 5.14.b.1.a of the Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations.

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:32:05

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the rescission to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- No one represented the property owner.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The resource has ceased to satisfy the Criteria for Designation because the qualities that caused its original entry have been lost or destroyed owing to the fire and subsequent demolition.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The Historical Commission can rescind the designation of 1533-41 N. 16th Street and remove it from the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, pursuant to Section 5.14.b.1.a of the Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Historical Commission rescind the designation of 1533-41 N. 16th Street and remove it from the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, pursuant to Section 5.14.b.1.a of the Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations.

ITEM: 1533-41 N 16TH ST**MOTION: Rescind designation****MOVED BY: Cooperman****SECONDED BY: Miller**

VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	X				
Suzanna Barucco					X
Jeff Cohen	X				
Bruce Lavery					X
Debbie Miller	X				
Elizabeth Milroy	X				
Total	4				2

ADDRESS: 1725 W TIOGA ST

Name of Resource: Gothic Revival House

Proposed Action: Rescission

Property Owner: Christian Street Baptist Church

Nominator: Historical Commission

Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov

OVERVIEW: The Historical Commission is considering whether to remove the property at 1725 W. Tioga Street from the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The Historical Commission designated the property on 28 September 1971. At the time of designation, a mid nineteenth-century, Gothic Revival house stood on the site.

The Historical Commission's minute from the meeting at which the property was designated on 28 September 1971 provides no information about the property and no clues to the Commission's findings regarding significance. Some quick research indicates that the building was erected by builder Hiram Miller and sold to lime dealer John R. Brownholtz (sometime spelled Brownholt) as his residence in 1851. At that time, the area around 17th and Tioga Streets was being developed from farmland into the suburban village of Kenderton. The area was named for Col. Kenderton Smith, who began selling his farm for subdivision in the 1840s. The process accelerated after Smith's death in 1851. The area was attractive for suburban development, owing to its proximity to the Tioga Station on the Germantown rail line as well as its adjacency to the Germantown Plank Road. Throughout the 1850s, Philadelphia newspapers advertised "cheap and desirable cottage lots at Kenderton, on the Germantown Railroad," and "neat cottages on Tioga Street" near to the Germantown Railroad Station.

Photographs of the house at 1725 W. Tioga Street taken by the Historical Commission in 1971 show that the house was intact and in apparently good condition. A 1983 zoning permit application seeking to use the building as a rooming house states that it "was formerly vacant, a breeding place for vandals, and a convenient hunting place for animals." A 1986 zoning permit application indicates that Excalibur Nursing Home Inc. sought unsuccessfully to convert the private dwelling for use as a nursing home. By the 1990s, the house had fallen into disrepair. In 1996, the Department of Licenses and Inspections declared that the house was imminently

Dangerous, noting that it had suffered fire damage and was in danger of collapse. It was demolished soon thereafter. The vacant lot was paved for parking between 2004 and 2008.

Section 5.14.b.1.a of the Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations stipulates that the Commission may rescind the designation of a building and remove its entry from the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places if the resource has ceased to satisfy the Criteria for Designation because the qualities that caused its original entry have been lost or destroyed. While the property was designated prior to the adoption of the current historic preservation ordinance and its Criteria for Designation, the house was presumably designated for its architectural qualities and as evidence of the mid nineteenth-century suburban village of Kenderton. Given that the Historical Commission was only empowered to designate "buildings" at the time this property was designated in 1971, it appears that all qualities of the property that led to its designation were lost or destroyed with the demolition of the building in the 1990s. The role of the Committee on Historic Designation in reviews such as this one is to determine whether the property retains elements or features that led to its original designation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends that the Historical Commission find the resource has ceased to satisfy the Criteria for Designation because the qualities that caused its original entry have been lost or destroyed, and that it rescind the designation of 1725 W. Tioga Street and remove it from the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, pursuant to Section 5.14.b.1.a of the Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations.

START TIME IN ZOOM RECORDING: 03:34:25

PRESENTERS:

- Mr. Farnham presented the rescission to the Committee on Historic Designation.
- No one represented the property owner.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- None.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS:

The Committee on Historic Designation found that:

- The resource has ceased to satisfy the Criteria for Designation because the qualities that caused its original entry have been lost or destroyed with the demolition of the building in the 1990s.

The Committee on Historic Designation concluded that:

- The Historical Commission can rescind the designation of 1725 W. Tioga Street and remove it from the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, pursuant to Section 5.14.b.1.a of the Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations.

COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation voted to recommend that the Historical Commission rescind the designation of 1725 W. Tioga Street and remove it from the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, pursuant to Section 5.14.b.1.a of the Historical Commission's Rules & Regulations.

ITEM: 1725 W TIOGA ST MOTION: Rescind designation MOVED BY: Cooperman SECONDED BY: Milroy					
VOTE					
Committee Member	Yes	No	Abstain	Recuse	Absent
Emily Cooperman, chair	X				
Suzanna Barucco					X
Jeff Cohen	X				
Bruce Lavery					X
Debbie Miller	X				
Elizabeth Milroy	X				
Total	4				2

ADJOURNMENT

The Committee on Historic Designation adjourned at 01:07 p.m.

PLEASE NOTE:

- Minutes of the Committee on Historic Designation are presented in action format. Additional information is available in the video recording for this meeting. The start time for each agenda item in the recording is noted.

CRITERIA FOR DESIGNATION

§14-1004. Designation.

(1) Criteria for Designation.

A building, complex of buildings, structure, site, object, or district may be designated for preservation if it:

- (a) Has significant character, interest, or value as part of the development, heritage, or cultural characteristics of the City, Commonwealth, or nation or is associated with the life of a person significant in the past;
- (b) Is associated with an event of importance to the history of the City, Commonwealth or Nation;
- (c) Reflects the environment in an era characterized by a distinctive architectural style;
- (d) Embodies distinguishing characteristics of an architectural style or engineering specimen;
- (e) Is the work of a designer, architect, landscape architect or designer, or professional engineer whose work has significantly influenced the historical, architectural, economic, social, or cultural development of the City, Commonwealth, or nation;
- (f) Contains elements of design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship that represent a significant innovation;
- (g) Is part of or related to a square, park, or other distinctive area that should be preserved according to a historic, cultural, or architectural motif;
- (h) Owing to its unique location or singular physical characteristic, represents an established and familiar visual feature of the neighborhood, community, or City;
- (i) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in pre-history or history; or
- (j) Exemplifies the cultural, political, economic, social, or historical heritage of the community.